

Renormalization of 1S_0 NN scattering amplitude in Effective Field Theory

J. Gegelia

*INFN - Sezione di Ferrara, Via Paradiso 12, 44100 Ferrara (FE), Italy
and
High Energy Physics Institute of TSU, University Str.. 9, Tbilisi 380086, Georgia*

G. Japaridze

*Center for Theoretical Studies of Physical Systems, Clark Atlanta University,
Atlanta, GA 30314, USA*

Cutoff regularized subleading order 1S_0 NN potential of effective field theory(EFT) is iterated using Lippmann-Schwinger equation. It is shown that the scattering amplitudes calculated in cutoff and subtractively renormalized EFT are equal up to the accuracy of performed calculations. Non-perturbative renormalization, where part of divergences are absorbed into two contact interaction coupling constants with subsequent removal of regularization is also performed. Cutoff and dimensional regularizations both lead to finite but different results within this scheme.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Nk, 11.10.Gh, 12.39.Fe, 13.75.Cs.

There has been significant development in effective field theory (EFT) approach to problems of multi nucleon systems originated by Weinberg's papers [1], [2]. (for recent developments see refs. [3], [4]). In Weinberg's approach power counting is formulated for effective potential and the scattering amplitude is calculated by substituting this effective potential into Lippman-Schwinger (or Schrödinger) equation. In ref. [5] it has been argued that Weinberg's approach suffers from formal inconsistencies. While this conclusion has been questioned [6], [7] a new explicitly consistent power counting (KSW power counting) has been suggested in ref. [8]. In this approach pions are included perturbatively and it allows to perform all calculations analytically which can be considered as a considerable advantage. Unfortunately it has been realized that perturbation theory series do not converge in this approach [7], [9], [10]. An attempt to combine the advantages of Weinberg's and KSW schemes has been made recently in ref. [11]. In that paper it has been confirmed that Weinberg's power counting is formally inconsistent in the 1S_0 channel NN scattering problem. In particular, divergences which appear in leading order, can not be absorbed by leading order counter-terms. Different approach to the problem of non-perturbative renormalization of Lippmann-Schwinger equation has been suggested recently in ref. [12].

In present letter, which is the continuation of the work started in refs. [13], [14], we follow Weinberg's approach and iterate sub-leading order 1S_0 NN potential in the framework of Lippman-Schwinger equation. We note that the above mentioned inconsistency of Weinberg's power counting manifests itself only when it is applied to unrenormalized diagrams and counter-terms separately. We advocate the point of view that the power counting should be applied to renormalized diagrams [6], [7], [15], [16]. Let us emphasize that we do not attempt to resolve the above mentioned formal inconsistency of Weinberg's power counting, we believe that it can not be resolved within this scheme. We share the point of view that this problem is irrelevant: if one applies the power counting to renormalized diagrams then there are no formal inconsistencies, renormalized diagrams are of the order which has been assigned by power counting and the approach is successful in studies of processes in few nucleon systems [17], [18], [19], [20]. This scheme can be implemented using BPHZ renormalization procedure. In BPHZ approach no counter-terms are included into the Lagrangian but instead the Feynman rules are accompanied by prescriptions for subtracting loop diagrams [21]. The subtracted diagrams depend on renormalization point(s). This dependence is cancelled by the renormalization point dependence of renormalised coupling constants so that the physical quantities are independent of the choice of subtraction point(s). The above mentioned problem of inconsistency that higher order counter terms contribute into the renormalization of low order diagrams translates now into the following problem: low order diagrams give large contributions into beta functions of coupling constants of higher order (counter) terms. There have been concerns that even if for some value of the renormalization point(s) the higher order coupling constants are tuned to be small, the slight change of this renormalization point(s) would result in large values for coupling constants and therefore power counting would be badly violated. Note that these concerns are based on perturbative estimations of beta-functions in the area where perturbation theory is not actually applicable. Hence

there is no reason to expect that the assumption of naturalness which is an ingredient of Weinberg's power counting is violated. To make any reliable conclusions about renormalization group behaviour of renormalized coupling constants non-perturbative analysis of this behaviour are required. We are not aware of any such analysis of renormalized coupling constants in EFT with explicitly included pions. On the other hand the considerable success of cutoff EFT, which is based on Weinberg's approach [17–20] suggests that renormalized coupling constants should be well-behaved.

Below we use Weinberg's power counting with BPHZ renormalization procedure and compare the results of subtractively renormalized and cutoff EFT for 1S_0 NN scattering amplitude. We find that the results of two schemes coincide up to the order of the accuracy of given calculations. We also explore the possibility of non-perturbative renormalization via absorbing part of divergences into the two available “bare” coupling constants with successive removal of regularization.

In this letter we quote the results, details of calculations will be presented elsewhere.

We iterate subleading order potential substituting it into Lippman-Schwinger equation. To perform subleading order analysis we include two-derivative contact interaction part of the potential for 1S_0 NN-scattering as it is enhanced in comparison with the two-pion exchange part [5] (note that to renormalize the amplitude obtained by iterating leading order potential no contact terms with derivatives are required [5], [11]) and therefore the sub-leading order potential has the following form:

$$V(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) = C + C_2 (\mathbf{p}'^2 + \mathbf{p}^2) + V_\pi(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) \quad (1)$$

where C and C_2 are (“bare”) coupling constants, and

$$V_\pi(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) = -\frac{4\pi\alpha_\pi}{(\mathbf{p}' - \mathbf{p})^2 + m_\pi^2}, \quad \alpha_\pi = \frac{g_A^2 m_\pi^2}{8\pi f_\pi^2}. \quad (2)$$

We need to extract the S -wave part from the solution to the Lippman-Schwinger equation for the NN scattering amplitude T :

$$T(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) = V(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) + \frac{M}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3\mathbf{q} V(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{q}) G(\mathbf{q}) T(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) \equiv V(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) + V(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{q}) \otimes G(\mathbf{q}) \otimes T(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}), \quad (3)$$

where

$$G(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{\mathbf{k}^2 - \mathbf{q}^2 + i\epsilon},$$

integration over “ $\mathbf{q}$ - variable” $\frac{M}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3\mathbf{q}$ is denoted by $\otimes$, M is the nucleon mass and $\mathbf{p}$ is on-mass-shell value of three-momenta. For physical amplitude $\mathbf{p}' = \mathbf{p}$.

When substituted into Lippman-Schwinger equation (3), potential $V(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p})$ generates divergences. To regularize potential we introduce factorized form-factor into the contact interaction part of $V(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p})$ and write:

$$V_R(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) = \left[C + C_2 (\mathbf{p}'^2 + \mathbf{p}^2) \right] \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{p}') \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{p}) + V_\pi(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}), \quad (4)$$

where χ is a regularization function. For definiteness let us use

$$\chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{p}) = \frac{\Lambda^4}{(\Lambda^2 + \mathbf{p}^2)^2}. \quad (5)$$

Using $V_R(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p})$ instead of $V(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p})$, we rewrite the Lippman-Schwinger equation (3) into the matrix form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} T(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}), & 0 \\ 0, & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{p}') \begin{pmatrix} 1, & \mathbf{p}'^2 \\ 0, & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} C, & C_2 \\ C_2, & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1, & 0 \\ \mathbf{p}^2, & 0 \end{pmatrix} \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{p}) + \begin{pmatrix} V_\pi(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}), & 0 \\ 0, & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \\ \frac{M}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3\mathbf{q} \left\{ \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{p}') \begin{pmatrix} 1, & \mathbf{p}'^2 \\ 0, & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} C, & C_2 \\ C_2, & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1, & 0 \\ \mathbf{q}^2, & 0 \end{pmatrix} \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{q}) + \begin{pmatrix} V_\pi(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{q}), & 0 \\ 0, & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\} \times \\ \begin{pmatrix} G(\mathbf{q}), & 0 \\ 0, & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} T(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}), & 0 \\ 0, & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (6)$$

We solve (6) for the 1S_0 amplitude and obtain:

$$T_0(p) = T_\pi + \frac{[C + 2p^2C_2 + C_2^2G_3(p)] V_1(p)^2 - 2C_2V_1(p)V_2(p) [1 + C_2G_2(p)] + C_2^2G_1(p)V_2^2(p)}{[1 + C_2G_2(p)]^2 - [C + 2p^2C_2 + C_2^2G_3(p)] G_1(p)}, \quad (7)$$

where T_π is 1S_0 wave solution of Lippman- Schwinger equation (3) for $V(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) = V_\pi(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p})$. Functions $G_i(p)$ are given by infinite series as follows:

$$G_1(p) = \chi^2(\Lambda, \mathbf{q}) \otimes G(\mathbf{q}) + \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{q}_1) \otimes G(\mathbf{q}_1) \otimes V_\pi(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) \otimes G(\mathbf{q}_2) \otimes \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{q}_2) + \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{q}_1) \otimes G(\mathbf{q}_1) \otimes V_\pi(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) \otimes G(\mathbf{q}_2) \otimes V_\pi(\mathbf{q}_2, \mathbf{q}_3) \otimes G(\mathbf{q}_3) \otimes \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{q}_3) + \dots \quad (8)$$

$$G_2(p) = \chi^2(\Lambda, \mathbf{q}) \otimes 1 + \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{q}_1) \otimes V_\pi(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) \otimes G(\mathbf{q}_2) \otimes \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{q}_2) + \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{q}_1) \otimes V_\pi(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) \otimes G(\mathbf{q}_2) V_\pi(\mathbf{q}_2, \mathbf{q}_3) \otimes G(\mathbf{q}_3) \otimes \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{q}_3) + \dots \quad (9)$$

$$G_3(p) = \chi^2(\Lambda, \mathbf{q}) \otimes G^{-1}(\mathbf{q}) + \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{q}_1) \otimes V_\pi(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) \otimes \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{q}_2) + \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{q}_1) \otimes V_\pi(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) \otimes G(\mathbf{q}_2) \otimes V_\pi(\mathbf{q}_2, \mathbf{q}_3) \otimes \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{q}_3) + \dots \quad (10)$$

and the functions $V_1(\mathbf{p})$, $V_2(\mathbf{p})$ satisfy integral equations:

$$V_1(\mathbf{p}) = \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{p}) + V_1(\mathbf{q}) \otimes G(\mathbf{q}) \otimes V_\pi(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}), \quad (11)$$

$$V_2(\mathbf{p}) = \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{q}) \otimes V_\pi(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) + V_2(\mathbf{q}) \otimes G(\mathbf{q}) \otimes V_\pi(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}). \quad (12)$$

Expression (7) for the amplitude remains valid in the framework of dimensional regularization provided that integrals are regulated using this regularization and χ -function is substituted by 1.

To give physical meaning to Eq. (7) we need to get rid off divergences, which show up in $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ limit. Note that the amplitude can be made finite using non-perturbative renormalization, i.e. renormalizing two available “bare” parameters C and C_2 and taking $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ limit in non-perturbative expression of $T_0(p)$.

Let us describe this procedure. We fix C and C_2 from two conditions of finiteness of the amplitude at $p^2 = 0$ and $p^2 = -\mu^2$ ($p = i\mu$). As $T_\pi(p)$ does not contain divergences, we require the finiteness of $a(p) \equiv 1/[T_0(p) - T_\pi(p)]$:

$$a(0) = \frac{[1 + C_2G_2(0)]^2 - [C + C_2^2G_3(0)] G_1(0)}{[C + C_2^2G_3(0)] V_1(0)^2 - 2C_2V_1(0)V_2(0) [1 + C_2G_2(0)] + C_2^2G_1(0)V_2^2(0)}, \quad (13)$$

$$a(\mu) = \frac{[1 + C_2G_2(i\mu)]^2 - [C - 2\mu^2C_2 + C_2^2G_3(i\mu)] G_1(i\mu)}{[C - 2\mu^2C_2 + C_2^2G_3(i\mu)] V_1(i\mu)^2 - 2C_2V_1(i\mu)V_2(i\mu) [1 + C_2G_2(i\mu)] + C_2^2G_1(i\mu)V_2^2(i\mu)} \quad (14)$$

In (13) - (14) $a(0)$ and $a(\mu^2)$ are finite.

Analyzing expressions (8)-(12) it is straightforward to obtain following relations:

$$G_1(p) = a_0\Lambda + a_1 \ln \Lambda + a_2(p) + 0(1/\Lambda) \quad (15)$$

$$G_2(p) = b_0\Lambda^3 + b_1\Lambda^2 + b_2(p)\Lambda + b_3(p) \ln \Lambda + b_4(p) + 0(1/\Lambda) \quad (16)$$

$$G_3(p) = c_0\Lambda^5 + c_1\Lambda^4 + c_2(p)\Lambda^3 + c_3(p)\Lambda^2 + c_4(p) \ln \Lambda + c_5(p) + 0(1/\Lambda) \quad (17)$$

$$V_1(p) = V_1(p) + 0(1/\Lambda) \quad (18)$$

$$V_2(p) = v\Lambda + d(p) + 0(1/\Lambda), \quad (19)$$

where $a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1, c_1, c_1, v$ are constants independent of Λ and $a_2(p), b_2(p), b_3(p), c_2(p) - c_5(p), V_1(p), d(p)$ are some functions of p also independent of Λ .

Substituting expansion (15)-(19) into expressions for $a(0)$ and $a(\mu)$ we solve the system of two equations for C and C_2 . Substituting these solutions for C and C_2 into expression for the amplitude (7) and taking into account expansions (15)-(19) we obtain in the limit $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ amplitude which is finite:

$$T_0(p) = T_\pi(p) + \frac{1}{\alpha(p)}, \quad (20)$$

where

$$\alpha(p) = \left\{ \left(a(\mu) V_1^2(\mu) + a_2(\mu) \right) (c_2(p) - c_2(0) - 4b_0 p^2) - (a(0) V_1^2(0) + a_2(0)) \times \right. \\ \left. (c_2(p) - c_2(\mu) - 4b_0 p^2 - 2b_0 \mu^2) + a_2(p) (c_2(0) - c_2(\mu) - 2b_0 \mu^2) \right\} / [(c_2(\mu) - c_2(0) + 2b_0 \mu^2) V_1^2(p)] \quad (21)$$

When using the same renormalization condition and dimensional regularization we obtain finite result which differs from (21) in analogy with the case of pionless EFT [22]. This difference between two results is due to the fact that dimensional regularization discards all power-law divergences, i.e. dimensional regularization is in fact not only regularization in standard sense but it also subtracts power-law divergences.

As it was argued in [23], the above described renormalization scheme is not consistent with EFT. To carry out the consistent renormalization procedure it is necessary to absorb *all* divergences into coupling constants or in other words, subtract all divergent integrals. To do so let us start from the observation that G_2 , G_3 and V_2 can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} G_2(p) &= \Delta_2 + \Delta_\pi G_1(p), \\ G_3(p) &= \Delta_3 + \Delta_\pi G_2(p), \\ V_2(p) &= \Delta_\pi V_1(p), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where

$$\Delta_2 = \chi^2(\Lambda, \mathbf{q}) \otimes 1, \quad \Delta_3 = \chi^2(\Lambda, \mathbf{q}) \otimes G^{-1}(\mathbf{q}), \quad \Delta_\pi = \chi(\Lambda, \mathbf{q}) \otimes V_\pi(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}). \quad (23)$$

Relations (22) are correct up to terms which are vanishing after renormalization is performed and regularization is removed, i.e. after sub-divergences and overall divergences are subtracted. Note that these relations become exact in dimensional regularization provided that in (23) χ -factors are substituted by 1.

Using relations (22) we express amplitude (7) as

$$T_0(p) = T_\pi(p) + \frac{V_1^2(p) [C - \Delta_\pi C_2 (2 + \Delta_2 C_2) + 2 p^2 C_2 + \Delta_3 C_2^2]}{1 + 2\Delta_2 C_2 + \Delta_2^2 C_2^2 - G_1(p) [C - \Delta_\pi C_2 (2 + \Delta_2 C_2) + 2 p^2 C_2 + \Delta_3 C_2^2]} \quad (24)$$

To renormalize amplitude (24) following standard BPHZ renormalization scheme we subtract divergent parts from $G_1(p)$, Δ_2 , Δ_3 and Δ_π and substitute C and C_2 by their renormalized values C_R and C_{2R} and obtain:

$$T_0^R(p) = T_\pi(p) + \frac{V_1^2(p) [C_R - \Delta_\pi^R C_{2R} (2 + F_2 C_{2R}) + 2 p^2 C_{2R} + (F_{31} + F_{32} p^2) C_{2R}^2]}{1 + 2F_2 C_{2R} + F_2^2 C_{2R}^2 - G_1^R(p) [C_R - \Delta_\pi^R C_{2R} (2 + F_2 C_{2R}) + 2 p^2 C_{2R} + (F_{31} + F_{32} p^2) C_{2R}^2]} \quad (25)$$

Here F_2 , F_{31} and F_{32} are (arbitrary) finite parts. Note that arbitrary finite parts are also present in Δ_π^R and $G_1^R(p)$, the particular choice for the finite parts corresponds to the particular choice of renormalization condition.

Expression (25) agrees with the one for the renormalized amplitude, obtained in the framework of dimensional regularization [5]. Amplitude obtained in [5] can be reproduced from Eq. (25) by appropriate choice of finite parts of $G_1(p)^R$ and Δ_π^R , and by the conditions $F_2 = F_{31} = F_{32} = 0$. Hence, as it was expected, dimensional and cutoff regularizations lead to the same results provided that the same renormalization condition is used.

Let us now turn to the cut-off EFT. In this approach we absorb part of divergences into the “bare” coupling constants C and C_2 but instead of considering $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ limit, we choose the value of cutoff parameter Λ in such a way that the amplitude of cut-off theory reproduces the above calculated subtractively renormalized amplitude up to sub-sub-leading order.

We determine C and C_2 from two conditions, the first of which is to absorb all terms in Eq. (24) for $p = 0$, which are divergent if the $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ limit is taken. This condition can be written as:

$$\frac{1 + 2\Delta_2 C_2 + \Delta_2^2 C_2^2 - G_1(p) [C - \Delta_\pi C_2 (2 + \Delta_2 C_2) + 2 p^2 C_2 + \Delta_3 C_2^2]}{V_1^2(0) [C - \Delta_\pi C_2 (2 + \Delta_2 C_2) + 2 p^2 C_2 + \Delta_3 C_2^2]} = \frac{1 + 2\Delta_{2R} C_{2R} + \Delta_{2R}^2 C_{2R}^2 - G_1^R(p) [C_R - \Delta_{\pi R} C_{2R} (2 + \Delta_{2R} C_{2R}) + \Delta_{3R} C_{2R}^2]}{V_1^2(0) [C_R - \Delta_{\pi R} C_{2R} (2 + \Delta_{2R} C_{2R}) + \Delta_{3R} C_{2R}^2]} \quad (26)$$

Another condition can be obtained by expanding Eq. (24) in powers of C_2 and requiring the finiteness of the first order term in $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ limit. Taking into account Eq. (26), this requirement can be expressed as

$$\frac{C_2}{C^2} = \frac{C_{2R}}{C_R^2} \quad (27)$$

Substituting the solutions to Eqs. (26)-(27) into the (unrenormalized) solution of Lippman-Schwinger equation given by Eq. (7) and expanding in powers of C_{2R} we obtain:

$$T_0(p) = T_\pi(p) + \frac{V_1^2(p) C_R}{1 + C_R (\Delta_1 - G_1(p))} + \frac{2 V_1(p) (p^2 V_1(p) - \Delta_\pi^R V_1(p) - C_R \Delta_2^R V_1(p)) C_{2R}}{(1 + C_R [\Delta_1 - G_1(p)])^2} + \frac{2 V_1(p) (\Delta_\pi V_1(p) - V_2(p)) C_{2R}}{(1 + C_R [\Delta_1 - G_1(p)])^2} + \frac{2 V_1(p) C_{2R} C_R \{\Delta_2 V_1(p) - G_2(p) V_1(p) + G_1(p) V_2(p)\}}{V_1(0) (1 + \Delta_1 C_R) (1 + C_R (\Delta_1 - G_1(p)) C_R)^2} + \dots, \quad (28)$$

where Δ_1 contains divergent part of G_1 as well as finite part, the latter depending on the choice of renormalization scheme. Note that fourth and fifth terms of Eq. (28) are suppressed by an additional factor of $1/\Lambda$ in comparison with third term. Higher order terms in C_{2R} which are indicated by dots are suppressed by higher orders of small parameter (three-momentum p , pion mass or the renormalization scale which we choose of the order of p). As our potential includes only leading and subleading order terms, calculated amplitude can be trusted up to this order, provided that formally higher order contributions are indeed suppressed. Note that these higher order terms also contain factors like $p^4 \Lambda^2 C_{2R}^2$. To suppress this kind of contributions as well as terms with inverse powers of Λ , we need to choose cutoff Λ of the order of large scale parameter Q which governs the behavior of C_R , C_{2R} [6], [13]. With this choice of cutoff parameter one can easily see that two amplitudes given by Eq. (25) and Eq. (28) coincide up to the order of accuracy of our calculations the difference being of higher order.

In this work we have iterated cutoff regulated 1S_0 partial wave NN potential of subleading order EFT and wrote a closed expression for the scattering amplitude. We have performed non-perturbative renormalization via absorbing part of divergences into two available coupling constants and taking the removed regularization limit. Within this renormalization scheme cutoff and dimensional regularizations both lead to finite results but these results differ from each other. This difference between two results is due to the fact that dimensional regularization discards all power-law divergences. We argue that this kind of renormalization is not consistent with EFT approach.

We advocate the point of view that Weinberg's power counting should be applied to renormalized diagrams [6], [7], [15], [16], i.e. one should draw all (an infinite number of them for NN-scattering) relevant diagrams, renormalize and sum them up. This summation is performed by solving Lippman-Schwinger equation (or Schrödinger equation). In fact we have solved the regularized equation and performed renormalization by subtracting divergences in the solution. For the case considered in this work it is not difficult to demonstrate that expanding the renormalized solution to the Lippmann-Schwinger equation we reproduce separate renormalized Feynman diagrams. Of course in general the solutions to Lippmann-Schwinger equation (or Schrödinger equation) can contain more contributions than just the sum of (an infinite number of) perturbative diagrams, but note that there is no power counting for such non-perturbative contributions.

We have implemented the renormalization procedure using BPHZ procedure. Within this scheme no counter-terms are included in the Lagrangian and therefore it is free of formal inconsistencies that to remove divergences from diagrams of given order calculations one needs to include contributions of counter-terms which are of higher order. Let us emphasize that we have not attempted to solve this problem of formal inconsistencies. We argue that this issue is irrelevant and it can be avoided by applying

power counting to renormalized diagrams. The usage of BPHZ renormalization proves to be very useful in dealing with this problem.

The main result of our work reads as follows. While the power counting is consistently formulated in subtractively renormalised EFT, in most cases we are not able to solve regularized equations and therefore it is technically very difficult (or rather impossible) to implement subtractive renormalization scheme. In practice most of practically important calculations are performed using cutoff EFT. For the potential considered in this work we have compared the amplitude of cutoff EFT with subtractively renormalized amplitude. The cutoff amplitude is equal to subtractively renormalized amplitude up to (including) sub-leading order, i.e. the difference between these two is of higher order than the order of the accuracy of our calculations (note that subtractively renormalized subleading order calculations reproduce the phase shift analyses for 1S_0 NN scattering reasonably well [14]).

We consider the present work as a demonstration of a general feature of cutoff EFT that it reproduces the results of subtractively renormalized theory up to the order of the accuracy of given calculations. This suggests that the considerable success of Weinberg's approach implemented in cutoff EFT [17], [18], [19], [20] is by far not accidental.

-
- [1] S. Weinberg, Phys. Lett. B **251**, 288 (1990).
 - [2] S. Weinberg, Nucl. Phys. B **363**, 3 (1991).
 - [3] S. R. Beane, P. F. Bedaque, W. C. Haxton, D. R. Phillips and M. J. Savage, nucl-th/0008064.
 - [4] P. F. Bedaque, M. J. Savage, R. . Seki and U. van Kolck, "Nuclear physics with effective field theory. II. Proceedings, INT Workshop, Seattle, USA, February 25-26, 1999," *Singapore, Singapore: World Scientific (2000) 368 p.*
 - [5] D. B. Kaplan, M. J. Savage and M. B. Wise, Nucl. Phys. B **478**, 629 (1996) [nucl-th/9605002].
 - [6] T. Park, K. Kubodera, D. Min and M. Rho, Nucl. Phys. A **646**, 83 (1999) [nucl-th/9807054].
 - [7] J. Gegelia, nucl-th/9806028.
 - [8] D. B. Kaplan, M. J. Savage and M. B. Wise, Phys. Lett. B **424**, 390 (1998) [nucl-th/9801034].
 - [9] T. D. Cohen and J. M. Hansen, Phys. Rev. C **59**, 13 (1999) [nucl-th/9808038].
 - [10] S. Fleming, T. Mehen and I. W. Stewart, Nucl. Phys. A **677**, 313 (2000) [nucl-th/9911001].
 - [11] S. R. Beane, P. F. Bedaque, M. J. Savage and U. v. Kolck, nucl-th/0104030.
 - [12] D. Eiras and J. Soto, nucl-th/0107009.
 - [13] J. Gegelia, J. Phys. **G25**, 1681 (1999) [nucl-th/9805008].
 - [14] J. Gegelia, Phys. Lett. B **463**, 133 (1999) [nucl-th/9908055].
 - [15] J. Gegelia, Phys. Lett. B **429** (1998) 227.
 - [16] G. P. Lepage, In **Seattle 1999, Nuclear physics with effective field theory** 353-365.
 - [17] U. van Kolck, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **43**, 337 (1999) [nucl-th/9902015].
 - [18] E. Epelbaum, W. Glockle and U. Meissner, Nucl. Phys. A **671**, 295 (2000) [nucl-th/9910064].
 - [19] E. Epelbaum, H. Kamada, A. Nogga, H. Witala, W. Glockle and U. Meissner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4787 (2001) [nucl-th/0007057].
 - [20] E. Epelbaum, U. G. Meissner, W. Glockle and C. Elster, nucl-th/0106007.
 - [21] J. C. Collins, "Renormalization. An Introduction To Renormalization, The Renormalization Group, And The Operator Product Expansion," *Cambridge, Uk: Univ. Pr. (1984) 380p.*
 - [22] S. R. Beane, T. D. Cohen and D. R. Phillips, Nucl. Phys. A **632**, 445 (1998) [nucl-th/9709062].
 - [23] J. Gegelia, In **Adelaide 1998, Nonperturbative methods in quantum field theory** 30-35. nucl-th/9802038.